<div align="center">REMARKS</div>

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated June 6, 2006. Claims 1-23 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 10, and 18 have been amended to clarify the concepts claimed therein. No adjustment in claim scope, however, is intended, and no new matter has been added with the amendments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,182,142 issued to Win et al. ("Win"). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the cited art.

Win teaches controlling access to one or more information resources stored on a first server by receiving information describing a user at the first server; and identifying a subset of resources that the user is authorized to access based on one or more roles that are stored in association with user identifying information (Win, column 2, lines 28-33). The described roles determine what resources a user can access (Win, column 5, line 50). Win teaches that the system enables administrators to implement access rules by defining roles that users play when working for an organization or doing business with an enterprise (Win, column 5, lines 28-30). A described role may reflect a relationship of a user to the organization, their department within the organization, or any other affiliation or function that defines their information needs and thus their access rights or privileges (Win, column 5, lines 30-36).

Claim 1, in contrast, specifies developing a role associated with an application based on accessed items and types of access determined from database access statements issued for the application during use. Win utterly fails to teach developing a role associated with an application based on determined accessed items and types of access. Instead, Win teaches allowing an administrator to define roles for users based, for example, on a function that defines their information needs or a relationship of a user to an organization or other affiliation. Thus,

Win fails to teach "analyzing database access statements issued for an application in use" or "developing a role associated with the application," much less developing a role associated with the application… wherein the role allows a user database access when the user is associated with the application." Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Win.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and, hence, contain all of its limitations, which have already been shown to be allowable over Win. Claims 2-9 also contain additional limitations not taught by Win.

For example, claim 2 recites "capturing the database access statements; normalizing the database access statements; and eliminating redundancies in the database access statements." But Win does not teach capturing, normalizing, and/or eliminating redundancies in database access statements. Instead, Win teaches that as a list of roles is developed, duplicates are eliminated and as a result a normalized list of roles is created (Win, column 14, lines 14-18). Accordingly, claim 2 is further allowable over Win.

As another example, claim 5 recites wherein developing a role comprises determining permissions for the application based on the determined accessed items and types of access. But Win does not teach determining permissions for an application based on determined accessed items and types of access. Instead, Win teaches determining based on one or more tokens whether the client is authorized to use a resource, where information defining a subset of resources a user is authorized to access and information defining roles are stored in the tokens (Win, column 2, lines 21-29; 34-36). Accordingly, claim 5 is further allowable over Win.

For at least these reasons, and for the reasons given with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 2-9 contain limitations not taught by Win. Thus, Applicant submits that theses claims are allowable over Win.

Independent claims 10 and 18 recite limitations similar to that of claim 1. In particular, the claims recite developing a role associated with an application based on determined accessed items and types of access. Accordingly, for reasons stated above in connection with claim 1,

claims 10 and 18 are also allowable over Win. The dependent claims of claims 10 and 18 are also allowable for at least the reasons stated above in connection the independent claims and claims 2-9.

Independent claim 23 recites limitations similar to that of claim 1. In particular, the claim recites developing a role associated with an application based on developed permissions, where permissions are developed based on accessed items and types of access. Accordingly, for reasons stated above in connection with claim 1, claim 23 is also allowable over Win.

Applicant : John D. Richter   Attorney Docket No.: 14012-053001/50-03-034
Serial No. : 10/736,001
Filed   : December 15, 2003
Page   : 11 of 11

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending rejections have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant believes no fees are due in connection with this submission. If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 05-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:09/06/2006   /William R. Borchers/

                                              William R. Borchers
                                              Reg. No. 44,549

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1717 Main Street
Suite 5000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 747-5070
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091

90189750.doc